

Int This is an interview with Peter Connell for the LRC Oral History Project and it's the 1st of April, April Fools Day (laughs).

PC How appropriate that you interview me! (laughs).

Int Peter, thank you very much for agreeing to be part of this project. I wondered whether we could start this Oral History interview by talking about your personal background and development of sense of social justice and how your early background may have led you into the legal profession?

PC Sure. We are all to varying degrees a product of our upbringing and education, and my upbringing was in an Irish Catholic family in New York. All my grandparents were immigrants and they left a British-ruled Ireland for opportunity in the United States. So at some level a sense was imparted to me by my grandparents of identification with the underdog, with the downtrodden, for example, as they had been and their forebears had been. And I was educated in Catholic schools right up till law school. And one of the main themes of Catholic education involved the nobility and worth of every person, and in particular the poor, the imprisoned, the downtrodden, that they were worthy people and they were entitled to our respect and to our assistance. So this is probably how I became interested in the civil rights movement in the United States. There was that feeling of empathy for people who had been on the receiving end of considerable injustice since the founding of our country. And so in 1968 I joined the Lawyers' Committee as Executive Director. We had one office in Jackson, Mississippi at the time, the cities were on fire, and we were setting about organising committees of lawyers in what turned out to be fourteen cities around the country. That was a very, very exciting time. It was the birth of public interest law. We were organising the big law firms to provide pro bono work, and on major cases, sometimes class action cases, law reform cases, and we had considerable assistance from the lawyers, the best of the Bar. And these were Republicans and Democrats, just terrific people who were involved in the Lawyers' Committee. And I did that for a couple of years and then had the opportunity to go to South Africa. An Assistant Dean at Yale Law School where I had studied, a man named Charlie Runyon, was then Assistant Legal Advisor in the State Department for Africa and later became the first Assistant Legal Advisor for the Human Rights. He was a terrific person, a real gentleman, one of the most decent people I'd ever met. And he took it upon himself to try to get me interested in southern Africa, particularly in what was going on in South Africa. In September of 1970 there was the first trial under the Terrorism Act in South Africa. There had been a trial in Namibia under the Terrorism Act before that, but this was the first in South Africa. As you may know the Terrorism Act prohibited a number of specific deeds, such as blowing up train stations, killing policemen, etc. The last prohibition was something like, 'or any other act that might tend towards the embarrassment of the administration of the affairs of state', and you're wide open. And the defendants had the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. So this was the first trial. Winnie Mandela was one of the people on trial. They had been...twenty-one of them and had been prosecuted under the Suppression of

Communism Act and then that prosecution was halted in the middle...the prosecution wasn't going well so they stopped it in the middle of the trial, they rearrested the accused in the dock and then they accused them under the Terrorism Act. I was asked to go and serve as an observer for the Lawyers' Committee and the American Bar Association at that trial. I studied up some on South Africa and then I went to that country. I did serve as an observer at the trial, but I had other life changing experiences when I was in South Africa. While the trial was going on, I stayed at a hotel in Johannesburg and I was dining alone in the dining room there once, I was reading the...I think it was the Johannesburg Star...and it had a front page story about a white South African doctor who had just spent a year going around reserves, the so-called homelands, doing a study on malnutrition, and he found that fifty percent of the children born on a typical reserve, died before they reached the age of five. The infant mortality rate amongst white South Africans at the time was 21 per thousand live births, like 2.1 percent, as supposed to fifty percent. Now "infant mortality" is up to age two, the other was up to age five, so it's not exactly comparable but a radical difference in child deaths, that was consequence of deliberate government policy. As I was reading this there was a string quartet of florid faced men playing these Viennese waltzes, and life was swirling around about me, people were speaking Afrikaans and it's sort of a guttural language, and I do not speak German, and it was like being put in a time machine and moved back to Berlin in 1937. Life was just going on so nicely for one group of people, and here was a group of people where fifty percent of their children were dying before they reached the age of five. You know, so I felt...it might have been one thing in 1937 not to have been able to predict the Holocaust, but the world lived through that experience. You can't doubt that something like this could happen again, and this was what was going on in a somewhat subtler way.

Two days after that I went to a Black Sash legal advice office and a woman was advising, what I then thought of as an elderly black couple, probably in their early sixties, about the Urban Areas Act which was designed to move blacks out of the urban areas, there was an exception and that is if you were born in a particular district and you were employed in that district, you could remain there with your family. Here was a man who had been born in a district and worked in the district and raised his family in the district, and his employer moved to an adjacent district. So now he no longer quite fit the exception. I felt almost like a voyeur. I looked at the faces of this man and woman as the legal advisor was explaining to them that they no longer fit the exception, but that she would write a letter to the authorities and see if he could keep his job and live in a bachelor quarters so that he could at least earn some money. Meanwhile the wife was to be sent to a reserve where she didn't even speak the language, a thousand miles away. But, you know, he could take the train there once a year and then...so I watched the faces of these people as they were being told that their lives together were over, and were over because of the operation of this statute. And of course if you heard white South Africans describe the statute...you know, of course these people have their lands and we have our lands, and it all sounds very rational, but this was the way it worked out in the lives of those people. It just made a tremendous impact on me, the degree of subjugation and exploitation and lack of care for these people, simply on the basis of their race, was shocking, was an anachronism, you know...and so having been exposed to that I realised I've got an obligation to do something about this, spend sometime trying to do something about it. The trial itself...stop me if I'm going on too long about any of this...

Int No, absolutely, it's a wonderful...

PC Ok, so with respect to the trial itself, the accused arrived in a truck, back of a truck with wood enclosures on three sides and concertina wire up over the top of the truck, like the way you transport cattle. And they filed in and they had added a twenty-second defendant who was a member of the ANC, then the banned ANC. And what they wanted to prove then is, he's a member of the ANC, the ANC has done these terrorist activities, they are also members of the ANC, so what he has done can be imputed to them as part of a general conspiracy. The defense was the defense of *autrefois acquit*, which is double jeopardy, basically. And Sydney Kentridge was the lead barrister in that case, a "counsel." Joel Carlson was the attorney. The trial lasted about four days and Sydney Kentridge...you know Sydney (Kentridge) and of course he's very understated, a world class lawyer...so he's going through this the twenty-two of them, he's saying, you know, in trial number one, accused A is now accused F in this, and was accused of serving as a link between B and C and now is accused of being a liaison between B and C and to show the charges are the same he's going through each and every charge, for each and every defendant...and so it's extraordinarily boring. After the second day I said, "Sydney, why don't you just put this all down on paper, you know, and give it to the judge?" And he just looked at me and he said, "In due course I think he will request that." (laughter) But his object of course was to bore the judge and make him sit through this and understand how every one, every charge was related to the initial charges in the first trial, and on the fourth day of course, the judge said, "Mr. Kentridge, do you by any chance have this down in writing?" I think we have. He gave it to the judge. I had a chance to have tea with the judge. He was an Afrikaner, and he was known to be a harsh judge. (*interruption*)

He was an Afrikaner, obviously appointed by the government, and I wanted the opportunity to meet him. Everyone knew I was an observer from the United States there, and I wanted to tell him whom I was representing and why we were there, and he listened, we had a very nice discussion, and at the end of it he said, "You know, Mr. Connell, it isn't easy to be a judge in South Africa, you cannot always be just, you simply have to take the law and apply it to the facts." And I thought, well, at least he understands the difference between real justice and that in South Africa. But as it turns out he acquitted all the original twenty-one...the one who was added was convicted, but all the others were acquitted. I met Winnie Mandela, who was a defendant, and had a chance to talk with her. She was striking in those days. She was tall and statuesque and she almost had an aura about her. When she walked into the courtroom as a defendant, people stopped and just looked. She had such presence. And when they left at the end of the day and they packed all the defendants into this truck, they left singing African freedom songs, you know. And I thought, "wow, this is a group that's not going to give up easily."

After the trial I went around South Africa, I didn't intend to do this, but I spent two weeks going around South Africa, meeting lawyers. Joel Carlson was coming under tremendous pressure from the government, they'd lifted his passport, his office had been bombed, his house had been bombed, and he was looking to get out, so I was looking for other lawyers with whom we might relate to and we might help in South Africa to bring these cases. I travelled all around the country and met quite a few of

them, and then I went back to the United States and I thought about it, I went around and I met the different people on the board of directors of the Lawyer's Committee. Jim Robertson was then the staff director, I was number two guy, executive director and he was getting ready to leave. He and Lloyd Cutler asked me if I would be interested in throwing my hat in the ring to consider succeeding Jim (Robertson). I said, no, I'm more interested in trying to start a project on South Africa. And at the time, Roxsana, there was not much interest in South Africa, even among black Americans. You know, the cities were still on fire, it was the height of the Black Power Movement in the United States, and their attitude generally was, hey, we've got enough problems in the United States, why this diversion? But you know, it's not inseparable, in that they were so related. Of course all that changed and black Americans really took the lead. I'm not a grand theoretician. I'm the kind of guy who sees a problem, I want to get in there and start pushing and pulling, and you look for openings, you know, and then you see where that opening will take you. So I did some grant applications. We got some money through some church groups and The Field Foundation, and then we applied for a big grant from the Ford Foundation. And essentially it was to work with lawyers in South Africa and help provide legal representation to people who run afoul of the apartheid legislation, and also to work here with the anti-apartheid groups. The Ford Foundation asked, given the fact that the law is so stacked against people in South Africa, what we can really hope to accomplish? And you may find the exact quote in Ann's book (Dr. Ann Connell, PhD., wrote her doctoral dissertation on the founding of the Lawyer's Committee. It was published by the American Bar Association), maybe, and if it's not I can get it for you if you like, but the answer we gave was something like this: "the day will come in Southern Africa when there will be an end to racial oppression and subjugation and cruelty, and when that day comes the question will be asked of the world...as it was after World War 2...what did you do for these people in their hour of darkest need? The Lawyers' Committee intends to have an answer." We don't know what our answer will be, we can't assure you that this works, but we need to try, we need to do our best. So we got the funding. I staffed it and we worked with Joel Carlson, with a number of other lawyers over there who had cases, we helped finance the cases, we sent memoranda of law over to them where there was some relevance to it. (Incidentally Sydney Kentridge...we had done that, on this trial of the twenty-two and Sydney Kentridge capped his four days of argument by citing the major double jeopardy case from the United States written, ironically, by Thurgood Marshall. That was his final argument.) We sent psychiatrists to over to talk about the unreliability of torture induced confessions, for example. And we sent over some other expert witnesses, and we helped fund some of the cases. We also served as lawyers for the anti-apartheid movement here in the United States, and I remember two cases in particular that I was involved in. One: we sued the New York Times for publishing ads for employment in South Africa. Eleanor Holmes Norton, who's now in Congress, was the head of the Human Rights Commission in New York City...she was a classmate of mine...we sued in the New York Human Rights Commission, because there was a statute that prohibited the publication of advertisements that expressed directly or indirectly an intent to discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, etc. So for example, you could not publish an ad for a home and then say, this is not near any synagogues, as it would have been an indirect expression...so our argument was, the use of the word "South Africa" in connection with an employment ad, where everyone knows that employment is by law not available on a racially non-discriminatory basis, transgresses the statute, and we won that case. Then it was

appealed and after I left the Lawyers' Committee, went up to the highest court in New York, and was reversed. It was overturned on a perverse theory, I mean, from a lawyer's point of view it was a dreadful decision. But in any event, that was one case.

I also represented the Congressional Black Caucus in a litigation before a Federal Agency challenging South African Airways' application to fly into Kennedy airport, on the grounds that they discriminate in "international air transportation." Now, they did not discriminate on their international flights. But, "international transportation" includes connecting flights, such as those from Cape Town to Johannesburg, which flights when they're internal in South Africa, were subject to discrimination. So we sued to deny them the landing rights they sought on the grounds that they were contravening this law that prohibits discrimination. And we settled that case, with South African Airways formally agreeing to desegregate all their flights, even internal flights. Even flights that were not connecting to international airports, that they would desegregate all of their flights. When we got that commitment we felt we had achieved something and so we settled. An interesting grace note to that story was, in 1994 I was flying to South Africa to serve as an international observer at the elections. I went up to Kennedy airport and I boarded the plane and I was sitting there kind of just thinking back over twenty-five years of anti-apartheid work, and thinking about that particular litigation which opened it up for them to land at Kennedy, and I had a man next to me who was a South African. He was chatting away, chatting away, and I tried to blow him off a couple of times but it was an impossible job, it was his first time in America and he was talking about how he'd gone to all these different cities and...finally he was so enthusiastic I gave up being alone with my own thoughts, and I asked him if he'd come here on business or pleasure? And he said that he'd come on business. So I said, "Oh, really, what line of business are you in?" And he said, "I'm a major in the South African Police." I said, "Really, what were you doing here?" And he looked at me and shrugged and he said, "I was taking) diversity training." (laughter) I thought, this is going to be a different South Africa that I'm going to this time!

So...these are the things that the project was to do, to work with lawyers in South Africa and also litigate here. And one of the decisions that we made early on it was to eschew rhetoric and not directly accuse the South African government of being a racist regime. American people could do that. But the reason I decided not to do that was, we're working with people like Sydney Kentridge and George Bizos and others, and they don't need to have people they're working with in the United States insulting their government. You know, it could have been very uncomfortable for them and it didn't add anything to what we were trying to do. Of course, there were times we were asked to sign on to statements by other groups in the anti-apartheid community and if I thought they were too confrontational I would not sign on. Not because I disagreed with them, but you've got to be a little careful because you've got to protect other people's reputations and you've got to know, this is what we can do, this is what we can do well and we can't jeopardise that. And in fact what happened many years later, South African Parliament passed a statute shutting down all foreign sources of funds to South Africa on these trials, with one exception, and it was the Lawyers' Committee. We were the exception. And we were the exception because we really tried to do it professionally, you know. And by the time apartheid ended...and Gay McDougal will be able to give you much better information...we had relationships

with about sixty lawyers in South Africa, most of whom were black lawyers who were working with us. We raised millions of dollars to help fund these human rights cases, a lot of it from the United Nations. And of course once we became the only group, the UN put a lot more money into the Lawyers' Committee that we used to fund this litigation. There's one other thing we became involved in, and that was the effort by shareholders to bring pressure on American corporations doing business in South Africa. I worked for Aetna at the time, and we were one of the biggest pension managers in the country, so we held stock in a lot of these corporations. And the man who was the Chairman of the Board at the time, was a man named John Filer, a very well motivated man. On many occasions we would bring to him the petitions to be filed at annual meetings, to be voted on at annual meetings, and very often it was, you know, the shareholders want information and answers to the following questions about our business in South Africa. They would ask how the blacks are treated and how the whites, again the differences and...of course the companies all opposed this. And (John) Filer would regularly call the chairman of the board of these companies, big American companies like Chrysler, and say to him, "I think that you ought to go along with this, they're just asking for information" and they would have this discussion and if he didn't get agreement he would say, "We own and vote these ten million shares in your company through all these pensions that we're managing, and we intend to vote with the insurgents on this. I just want to extend you the courtesy of telling you that." And at least on one occasion that I know of, the CEO of that company said, "Well, I'm very sorry to hear that John, because we've enjoyed having our tens of thousands of employees covered by Aetna Health Insurance, but I guess you have to do what you have to do, and I'll have to do what I have to do." I mean, a direct threat to cancel, and John Filer said, "Yes, it's your prerogative, I've got to do what I've got to do," and he voted that way. So he was a terrific guy.

I also served on the Yale committee that looked into the question of what Yale should do with the stock that it held in its portfolio, of companies that did business in South Africa. We met for eight weekends in New Haven and discussed this. I was the only alumnus. There was the Treasurer and some professors and some students and whatnot. I had an idea that I wanted to sell. The main argument against divestment was that it would cost an institution a lot of money to divest, particularly an institution like Yale. Understand, no institution can really be asked to commit financial suicide on behalf of a moral statement. So I came up with a suggestion for something I called "progressive divestment." Yale turned over a quarter of its portfolio every year, a normal event. So the "progressive investment policy" would involve telling your portfolio managers, over time we want to be out of the ownership of the American companies that do a substantial amount of business in South Africa because we don't want to profit by the exploitation of people along racial lines. And we want you to have this as one of your criteria governing your management of our portfolio. Well, it was adopted by the committee and then given to the Board of Directors at Yale, called the Yale Corporation, and they waited till June till the students went home and then voted it down, so we never got it. And I was really disappointed in that because I thought that really could have worked, and if Yale had done something like that, a lot of other universities would have followed. But it wasn't adopted. The only point of this is, when we decided, the Lawyers' Committee early on, to get involved and do something, we didn't know where that would lead, but the need was so great that you had to believe that the opportunities would be there if you pushed hard and if you

tried to be creative. We had a lot of opportunities. Got the project well funded and at that point I'd been with the Lawyers' Committee for over five years and I thought, now it's time for me to move on -- I was in my mid thirties -- and turn it over to somebody else to carry it on, which we did. It went to a succession of people who did it for short periods and then Gay McDougall who ran it so well. I got that started, but that's all I did. And then she just did a magnificent job and it made a big difference in terms of what one American institution can do in affecting something going on across the world.

We also financed the Biko inquest that Sydney Kentridge conducted and I asked the Dean of Yale Law School, Dean Louis Pollak, to go over and serve as an observer for that. We sent over some high level observers to different things and we...we generally broadened the level of interest too among lawyers, in fact that's how Lloyd Cutler became involved in southern Africa and seeing what lawyers could do in South Africa. Then of course he met the Kentridges and when Felicia (Kentridge) started the LRC. Lloyd (Cutler) and Erwin Griswold and Louis Loss, decided to create an institution here to help raise money for the LRC. So there was that connection between the early work of the Lawyers' Committee and what was then SALSLEP through Lloyd Cutler and Erwin Griswold. Now, I'll stop my monologue, and let you ask the next question (laughs).

Int Well that was wonderful, thank you very much. I'm wondering if I can take you right back...growing up in New York of immigrant parents, etc,

PC Grandparents were immigrants, yes.

Int Yes...what are your memories in terms of identity and your positioning within New York society? Growing up were there issues around discrimination, etc, where you think your sense of social justice may have been formulated? This would have been post war years...

PC I was born in 1937. Post World War One! I grew up in forties in Queens, went to high school in Brooklyn. My father was a doctor. He was raised in Hell's Kitchen. And my mother was raised in Harlem. Her father was a policeman, police sergeant. Education was a big theme in my life growing up, as it had been for my parents. My mother was a college graduate teacher and my father of course was a doctor and they had...we had other relatives who didn't have that much education and therefore that much opportunity. So it was made clear to me early on, this is a meritocracy, if you want up and out it's through education, and also education is a value in its own right. New York was a very ethnic city in those days. There were enclaves...it was less so than in my father's day. In my father's day, everyone knew that 10th Avenue between 47th and 46th was all Irish. And 11th Avenue between 46th and 47th, was all Italian. And people...women could live a lifetime in New York and only speak Polish or Italian, if they were stay-at-home moms. I did not have any interaction with black people. There were only a couple of black boys in my high school. But I grew up in a largely Jewish neighbourhood so I had friends who were Jewish, friends who were Italian, friends who were German, Polish, and...I didn't grow up with a sense of what discrimination

black people were living under. Although interestingly my hero, when I was ten years old, was Jackie Robinson. I happened to be a Brooklyn Dodgers fan, that's when I became a Brooklyn Dodgers fan, and I loved him, not only because he was so talented, but also he represented the challenge to conventional way of doing things, and you know, I've got a rebellious Irish temperament. They tell the joke about the Irishman coming out of a pub in Dublin at one o'clock in the morning, and sees two men duking it out at the corner and he walks up to them and he says, excuse me gentlemen, is this a private fight or can anyone get in? (laughter) There is something about the Irish temperament, you know, they don't call people the fighting Finns. There's a little something about it, there was just scrappiness that was part of it, and an identification with my immigrant past, with the subjugation that my grandparents had lived under, with their denial of education in British-ruled Ireland at the time. So I had in that sense an empathy for people who were not blessed with a lot of gifts, who weren't part of the establishment but who were challenging it. It's also kind of an American disposition to root for the underdog as well. And a Christian respect for the dignity of everyone. Then, as I became a lawyer, the Civil Rights Movement kicked in. I mean, we were just blessed with being in the right place at the right time. So here comes the Civil Rights Movement and I'm a lawyer down here in Washington, I'm able to participate in it, and try to advance the ball a little bit, so I thought it was a great opportunity and got in it, and we met and I dealt with wonderful, wonderful people. Jim Robertson and I talk about one of the great things that happened to us was just the exposure to these leading lawyers who, a lot of them, were white Anglo-Saxon Protestant Republicans, but who had this sense of justice, this sense of what's right and wrong, and what America symbolises, and were prepared to devote the resources of their law firms and their own reputations to advance this. It was a wonderful era, you know, wonderful thing to be able to participate in, and I just feel very blessed that I had that opportunity.

Int In terms of formative experiences, do you think there was any particular incident that may have inspired you down the legal path, in particular?

PC No, you know, I drifted into the law. I finished college...this is a long story involving a broken romance and you don't want to hear that whole thing (laughter), but the short of it is, I had no skills, I'd finished college, did a stint in The Marines and I knew what I didn't want to be, I didn't want to be a doctor, just as my father was. My father actually said, "Well you ought to think about the law because a law degree is like a key, it opens many doors." Talk about opening doors, here's my daughter, Michaela (Connell), if you'd like to pause... (*interruption*)

So I drifted into the law. I loved Yale Law School. It was, as Judge Bork would say it was an intellectual feast. I really worked hard for the first year or so, and then pretty much got bored with the case study approach. But the thing about Yale University was that every...you probably had the same thing at Harvard...every Sunday evening they would post in the library all the events that were taking place, the lectures and plays and everything, at the university over the next week. And I had two jobs and...paid jobs, and I was Director of the Public Defender but I would just say, ok, Monday I'll do this, Tuesday I'll do that, and then I squeezed in the studying. But for me it was a great opportunity for the rounding out of a formal education, of course it

was not a Catholic school, the people came from a whole diversity of backgrounds and it was just a terrific opportunity for me. There were so many students as well professors who sort of looked at the big picture and thought about using the law, not just to further one's own economic and professional interest but to advance society. It just opened me up in so many ways and I'll always be grateful for that, but I never really wanted to practice traditional law. I realised that when I was in law school, but after 10 years in Government jobs and the Lawyers' Committee -- I had a wife and three children -- so then I became a partner in a law firm here and then became Vice President at Aetna. They were my biggest client and they hired me. As it happens I really liked that job very much over twenty-five years because I was a problem solver that was my job. They had a lot of problems across a whole range of their businesses, and my job was not to dig really deeply into any one, but to manage it and hire lawyers and law firms and lobbyists. I really enjoyed that, and I enjoyed moving from one issue to another. There are a lot of lawyers who develop real expertise in some area or another but I'm the kind of person who gets bored easily. I need other challenges, I need to bounce around things. It's just a matter of temperament, I'm not saying it's better or worse, it's just temperament. I actually found the right kind of challenge for me and I used that as a stable financial base from which I did other things like the Lawyers' Committee and SALSLEP and the DC Prisoners and other things on the side.

Int Well, we'll come to that. I'm wondering at Yale Law School, you mentioned you really enjoyed it, after law school was the first step The Lawyers' Committee or were there other things that you did before you went into that?

PC No, the first step was the CIA.

Int Right, ok. You mentioned that at lunch. I'm fascinated, Peter.

PC Yes, well, you know, nowadays if you tell people that... Ann (Connell) was telling Judge Oberdorfer's clerks, because he also was at Yale Law School...that I went from Yale Law School to the CIA. Their jaws dropped. It was a different era, it was the height of the Cold War. President (John, F) Kennedy inspired young people of my generation to come to Washington to do interesting, exciting things. At the time that I made the decision I was not married. I had this Marine Corps background, and counter insurgency was the big sexy thing to do. And it seemed a free-wheeling kind of challenge with some personal risk that was also attractive. So I did come through and went to the CIA. And...I won't say got disillusioned because any country that wants to play a leading role in international matters needs a strong intelligence capability. If we had a stronger one we wouldn't have wars in Iraq. So you need that. But I found that personally it wasn't a fit for me and that...so some of the counter insurgency work that was going on, it seemed to me, we were not on the right side. A lot of countries were, including Vietnam...were pressing for national liberation at the end of colonialism and the Communists were helping them... as they were helping the ANC. You take the help where you can get the help. And we were just labeling movements as Communist instead of trying to understand what the people were really striving for. That came into it and intelligence work, espionage work, all revolves around duplicity and using people. I understood I didn't want to get good at that. It

was just not a...someone with my whole background and education, this was just not what I wanted to do with my life. So they put me in General Counsel's office and looked around for long term deep cover assignment where I'd go out as a lawyer somewhere, and for a whole lot of reasons that didn't work and then I was offered a position on Capitol Hill working as a legislative assistant to a Member of Congress. It was the beginning of the Great Society. Also the assassination of (John, F.) Kennedy took a lot of the enthusiasm out of me and out of a lot of other people. Lyndon Johnson just wasn't John Kennedy. But in any event I went to work on the Hill for more than a year and then a friend of mine brought me over the international side of the General Counsel's Office of Treasury and I was there for a couple of years. That was all very abstract kind of legal work, and it was fun. But then of course you have the late sixties and you had this strong emergence of the Civil Rights Movement and the assassinations of Martin Luther King...when I went to the Lawyers' Committee it was before the assassination of Bob (Robert) Kennedy. It was then called the "President's Committee", because it had been organised at the request of President Kennedy. It just held forth a lot of promise of an organisation that could make a significant difference in a good cause, and that's why I wound up there.

Int Certainly Kennedy's assassination, the loss of John F Kennedy, is a turning point in American history... and I'm wondering whether that may have been a turning point in terms of the type of law you wanted to undertake, or perhaps there's no association?

PC Well, it certainly forced me to think more independently about whether our foreign policy was the right foreign policy or not. With (John, F) Kennedy, I so admired him, I was so swept up in this, that I wasn't disposed to be critical in my assessment of our foreign policy. But when he was assassinated my evaluations were more critical and more negative. So in a way that did move me out of the CIA...that's one of the factors that moved me out of the CIA. But also he was a strong supporter of the Civil Rights Movement, so was Bob (Robert) Kennedy. And you know, after the assassination of Martin Luther King, I thought this is an effort that I want to identify myself with that I want to contribute toward. And in that sense I suppose...yes, and then of course Bob Kennedy was killed in June of '68 and the leadership of the Lawyers' Committee was in large part made up of people who had been with Kennedy at the Justice Department: Lou Oberdorfer, John Nolan, Nick Katzenbach, John Douglas, John Doar, Steve Pollack, Burke Marshall, all these people who had played prominent roles there and also some other "Bishops of the Bar" from Philadelphia and New York. But it was a way that the people could carry on the best of the Kennedy idealism it seems to me. It was a great privilege and opportunity for me to associate myself with that.

Int Certainly, earlier on you said that your decision to really start the South African Project in the Lawyers' Committee was...it seemed...a conscious decision and a need to make a contribution in terms of effecting social change. You've just said as well that there was certainly a conscious decision to join the Lawyers' Committee and the aim to contribute to social change, and I'm wondering whether you see that...?

PC Oh, yes, it was a conscious decision...There's a difference between the two decisions. The Lawyers' Committee, because of the people who were on the board, was a strong institution already making a difference in Mississippi and destined to make significant

impact in many of the cities where we were starting our local committees. The decision to try to start up a Southern Africa Project was much more problematic in terms of its success. I decided that I would give it a couple of years, spend a couple of years to really try to create something that could make a contribution to the advancement of racial justice in South Africa. There were no models, there were no foundations looking to give money for this, there was very limited support on the board of directors of the Lawyers' Committee but the some people, particularly George Lindsay was a very strong supporter. John Douglas was a supporter. But it was a minority of the board, they were typical of everybody else at the time: "That's another problem, we've got enough problems here in the United States." So the chances of that effort's succeeding were not really very bright, but as I said, that dawning realisation as I sat in the dining room of the hotel that night and watching the faces of two people who were told their lives together are over, I mean, these things just grabbed me. It's not like I read something in a book that persuaded me this might be a good thing to do. It just grabbed me by the heart and I couldn't let go until I thought that I had really done my best, at least for a couple of years, to get something started. You know, I was in my mid thirties and, you run into the whole lateral entry problem in the law. You do reach a point where your options tend to narrow and I knew that point was coming. But it was just such an exciting opportunity where the need was just so pressing that it was irresistible.

Int Right. In terms of placing the dates, you had joined the Lawyers' Committee before 1970?

PC In June of '68 I joined.

Int June '68, ok. So prior to your trip in 1970 to South Africa, what was your knowledge about apartheid, about South Africa and the problems there?

PC It was about the same as that of any well educated American and no deeper. But Charlie Runyon kept sending me things, from the Department of State, and he was a very subtle man. But he kept sending me things to interest me, to perk my interest, you know. George Lindsay had gone to South Africa, for the Lawyers' Committee, even before, and basically Charlie (Runyon) was suggesting, "Hey, you know, maybe the Lawyers' Committee could help here, you ought to take a look at this." And then when that trial came up, he suggested that I go over there for that. And I almost didn't make it. In those days in order to get a visa one had to go to New York and meet with the Consul General. So I went to New York to meet with him and I told him I was to go over there on behalf of the Lawyers' Committee and the American Bar Association, and he said, "Oh the Lawyers' Committee," he said, "that's the group that George Lindsay went for last year"...and I think George's brother John (Lindsay) was then mayor of New York...so I said, "Yes, that's right." And he looked at me and he said, "a singularly unproductive visit" (laughter). He said, "how would you like it if foreigners came to your country and criticised." And I said, "It's a wide open country, you know, we've got a lot of things that are wrong with this country, we welcome all the suggestions we can get." He didn't like that. And I don't think he would have approved it, except for the fact that I organised my visit with him to be just before a meeting that some of the "Bishops of the Bar" on our committee had

scheduled at the Century Club in New York to meet with the outgoing US Ambassador to South Africa, a man by the name of (John Gavin) Hurd, a Republican. It was clear this interview was going nowhere with the Consul General, and finally I looked at my watch and I said, "I'll be glad to come back but I'm supposed to be down at the Century Club to have lunch with Ambassador Hurd," and I could see its reaction. He said, "you mean Ambassador Hurd?" And I said, "Yes, George Lindsay and some other members of our board and I are having lunch with him. And he said, "ok." Then I left. And I think that's why I got that visa. Thereafter they wouldn't let anybody in from the Lawyers' Committee.

Int Really?

PC Yes. None of the staffers could get in from the Lawyers' Committee after that.

Int Gosh.

PC Yes. Because they just...they wanted to shut us down as much as they could.

Int So when you went to South Africa, you've mentioned your experiences, I'm just wondering, knowing about something from afar and then actually experiencing it, the disjuncture between those two...

PC Yes, it was enormous. It was enormous in two respects. One, the level of prejudice and denigration of people of colour in South Africa, and also the police state quality to it. It was a powerful, emotional experience for me, and I had great admiration for the lawyers who were working there, the Kentridges and Chaskalsons and George Bizos and the others. And I could see there was an opportunity, since South Africa prided itself on being a country that honoured the rule of law, and in a way they did. If they had a statute that required the execution of all thirteen year old black males, you'd get a scrupulously fair trial to see if you were black and if you were male and if you were thirteen. But, you could also see that we could use the courts as a forum for broadcasting to the world the reality of life in South Africa. In addition it gave the people involved in the ANC, it gave them hope, it gave them a sense that they weren't just some little guy picked up in some small town in South Africa that no-one would ever hear about. But that there were funds coming from America to support that effort, and it gave people a feeling that they're part of something larger than themselves. And, you know, in the scheme of things and in the course of history, there was some hope that they might actually prevail some day. So it contributed that as well, I think.

Int Was your first acquaintance with the Kentridges at that point in 1970, or had you known them prior to this?

PC No, that was my first acquaintance. That was with Sydney (Kentridge) in the trial. Then I went to their home and met with Felicia and Sydney (Kentridge), I had dinner

with them one night when I was there, and then we corresponded. It was mainly with Sydney (Kentrige) after that. I wrote an op-ed piece for...that appeared in the Washington Post, on that trial. I may still have a copy around...

Int That would be wonderful. Thank you...

PC Yes, I think I can probably find that. All my files at Aetna, I just left that. I turned a corner in my life and I just left...I'm not a collector. But I do think I have a copy of that and I'll be glad to send it to you. But again, it was something entitled like "South African Justice, Trial, Acquittal and Punishment." Because when they were acquitted they were immediately banished and banned. But I was very careful in how I characterised the lawyers' – (Sydney) Kentridges and others -- attitude towards the judge and towards the court and everything else. And then we followed up and I think that they gained some confidence that the Lawyers' Committee would be responsible and not get them in trouble. Then we sent over expert witnesses, so that effort continued, and Gay (McDougall) can tell you the most about it because she presided over most of it.

Int As you know, I've interviewed Felicia (Kentrige) last year, and I think it's fair to say that Felicia (Kentrige) is really the brainchild behind the formation of the LRC...

PC Yes.

Int I'm wondering, given that you're in a very unique position in that you got to know the Kentridges much earlier; this predates the idea of public interest in South Africa and the formation of the LRC, at that point from 1970 onwards in your correspondence, did discussions emerge in terms of public interest law organisations and how that could be useful in South Africa...?

PC No. Sydney (Kentrige) did come over here once or twice to...I'm trying to place the Biko inquest, that was mid seventies, and Sydney (Kentrige) did come over here and he hired a pathologist from John Hopkins in connection with the inquest, and Sydney (Kentrige) and the pathologist and I met in our conference room. I would send them information about the Lawyers' Committee and it was a public interest law group, so she knew that was going on in the United States, but...no, I would claim no credit for influencing her very independent and creative thinking about what could be done in South Africa. This was really her brainchild and of course once again, she and the others knew how far they could push it and how far they couldn't push it, and you really just had to respect that. And then...I think that's how they got to know Lloyd Cutler, through the Lawyers' Committee. And Lloyd Cutler...when did she actually start the LRC?

Int 1978, early 1979...

PC Yes, so Lloyd Cutler would have been counsel to President (Jimmy) Carter at the time. And he had been involved in Southern Africa matters through the Lawyers' Committee. And Lloyd (Cutler)...bear in mind he was a very significant partner in a Washington law firm and he represented, I think it was General Motors, and probably a lot of other big American companies that had business in South Africa. So he had a line that he had to walk. But that's ok, because you know, you can use his substantial influence to move certain things that you wouldn't have been able to move otherwise. I mean he,...and I offer this not as a criticism of Lloyd (Cutler) in any way because most people in his position couldn't have cared less and wouldn't have jeopardised their relationship with those clients by doing things in South Africa. Lloyd (Cutler) did do that, he did it very prudently. But of course if you're a South African lawyer, you want prudent people on the other side and not people who are going to say things or do things that could get you in trouble.

Int Absolutely. At what point did you start the South Africa Project within the Lawyers' Committee?

PC 1970. Actually some people date it to George Lindsay's first trip there in 1969. But when I came back in '70, I went around New York and spent a couple of days meeting one on one with the leadership of the committee, telling them about the trip and whatnot, and then urged them to let me try to start a Southern Africa Project, and here's what I would think the Southern Africa Project might be able to do in terms of relating to the lawyers over there. And they basically they said, give it a try and see what you can do. And I did, I was doing my other work at the same time but, you know, it finally worked. One other thing I did...when it came to leave, I think it was '73...I knew that when some people who had done some good things at the Lawyers' Committee left, sometimes their projects would atrophy, and I wanted to leave when we had a fully funded project, so we could recruit some good person. They'd know they had a couple of years of funding. But I was concerned that the attention for the project might fade. So I formed a sub-committee, it was the only sub-committee of the board, a Southern Africa sub-committee, George Lindsay was on it, Ted Sorenson, John Douglas, other people who were interested... and I reported directly to them. I wanted to assure some structure that would promise continuity here. And it lasted right up till 1994.

Int In 1974 there was a key public interest law conference in South Africa and I'm wondering whether you were involved in that at all? It was something where really the first ideas germinated with the formation of the LRC, with Clinton Bamberger going over...

PC Did Clint Bamberger go to that?

Int Yes.

PC No, I did not go to that, I had left the Lawyers' Committee, the man who organised the American participation in it, was a fellow by the name of Rod Boggs. Rod Boggs succeeded me on kind of a part-time basis while he headed the local DC Lawyers'

Committee. He still heads that as a matter of fact. And he's another...he was a very, very committed and creative fellow. And he was involved in that and so he brought David Tatel over and Clint(on) Bamberger and some others...I think David (Tatel) was then the Director of the Lawyers' Committee...and Rod (Boggs) brought the over and in part it was to help explain to the other people at the conference some of the things that we were doing here. And in part it was to expose the Bambergers and Tatel and others who were already deeply committed here, to the situation in South Africa, and they came back committed just as I had.

Int So following on from that conference, I think this idea was really discussed and Felicia (Kentridge) and Arthur (Chaskalson) realised that an organisation was needed, so by 1978 the LRC was formed. I'm wondering in terms of when you left the Lawyers' Committee in '73 to when you joined SALSLEP, the board, in between, what were your activities with regard...?

PC Yes, with respect to South Africa, when I left the staff of the Lawyers' Committee, I was elected to the Board of Directors and I was put on the Southern Africa Committee. And so I worked with Rod (Boggs) for example, and then there were a couple of other successors...did you ever meet a fellow by the name of Millard Arnold?

Int No.

PC He's an ex patriot, he's married to a South African woman, I think he lives in South Africa. He ran a project for about two years. He's an African American. Another man by the name of Mike Peay was there for a short period. He's an African American, and he was later with the Legal Advisor's Office in the State Department. And then Gay (McDougall) came and ran it like from 1980 on. And so my involvement was as a part of the Southern Africa Sub-Committee, and as a member of the board, and I helped them raise money for the South Africa Project. I participated in that Yale effort, worked with some of the anti-apartheid groups, had connection with shareholders, actions, that kind of thing.

Int So your next trip to South Africa would have been in 1994?

PC Yes.

Int So by this time...prior to 1994, I think looking at the late seventies, early eighties, you were on the board of the Lawyers' Committee, South African Project Sub-Committee, and I'm wondering...did you move to Aetna by this time?

PC Yes.

Int Right, ok. I'm wondering whether you had discussions with Felicia and Sydney (Kentrige), and Arthur (Chaskalson) perhaps, about the formation of the LRC and how you actually got involved into SALSLEP...at what point?

PC I did not have discussions with them about the LRC. I may have heard about it through Clint(on) (Bamberger), because Clint(on) (Bamberger) got to know them when he was over teaching at Wits. But I did not have any discussions with them about the LRC. I knew Lloyd Cutler and Erwin Griswold, those two formed SALSLEP and that was after, a few years after the LRC was formed.

Int Shortly after, yes. Early eighties.

PC Early eighties, yes. And of course that was formed to help raise money for LRC. I was invited to join that board, and we were really trying to do two things there. One, was to raise money for the LRC, but also to maintain a direct communication, direct link, in a way to give them a little protection. The government there was very much knowledgeable about what they were doing and disposed to put pressure on in various ways. But, you know, (Lloyd) Cutler had been Counsel to the President, Erwin Griswold had been Solicitor General of the United States, and Bill Coleman, I don't know when Bill Coleman came on, he was another member of the Lawyers' Committee board, he'd been Secretary of Transportation. So there were a lot of prestigious, influential people who were on the board. And so, South Africa had to understand that if they put too much pressure on the LRC these people of the United States would hear about it and react to that. And we were...our country was an ally of theirs at that time, although less so with Jimmy Carter, I think, with (Richard) Nixon and (Gerald) Ford. But so...so partly, mainly I suppose it was to provide money, but also it was to provide that professional link at a high level for whatever moral support that would lend to people, and not only as a bulwark against South Africa but also as evidence to the LRC people who were on the front lines then, that what they were doing was important and respected by people who were trying to do similar things in the United States.

Int I'm wondering, and I think this is a question you've answered to some extent but I'll ask it anyway...given that Parliament was supreme in South Africa, what did you think about the chances of the LRC's legal victories not being overturned, because they weren't really overturned, and what do you attribute that to?

PC Yes, you made...an assessment at that time of those possibilities. But in the final analysis we have no control over a lot of these things. But, you know, you do what you can do because that's your personal responsibility, and you do it carefully and professionally and thoughtfully, and you may win some victories. They may be overturned, but some of them won't be overturned. And isn't that better than making the a priors decision, that the apartheid government has the absolute authority and we exist at their sufferance so really there's very little that we can do, so why bother? And these were leading lawyers in South Africa, and they were again, they were supporting a movement...you know the famous Bob Kennedy quote about throwing a pebble into a pond, and...don't you know that quote? It's a great quote. And he made

this in South Africa and I can only paraphrase it and not do it justice but...it's to the effect that every time a person stands up against injustice and oppression, it's like throwing a pebble into a pond and enough pebbles thrown in from enough different directions can create ripples which cause a mighty current that can sweep down the walls of oppression and resistance. And so that's what each individual person's effort is, and I think that that may have been on their mind. Also, sure it can be overturned but, you know, let's see what we can do and let's think creatively...and they were also very savvy politically. You know, they know, in the end, sure they can overturn it but there are areas here where they might not want to overturn it for various reasons. And they could press in those areas. But...that was never something that bothered me with respect of the LRC, and I never frankly heard it come up in a conversation at a SALSLEP board meeting. I mean, everyone recognised, there are limits and we can't transcend those limits and we don't control those limits but these people, the Kentridges and others, they know where those limits are and they know how to manage things within the law and let's support them to the greatest extent that we can.

Int I'm sure you've met Arthur (Chaskalson)

PC Yes, I have met Arthur, yes. Arthur's coming to a book club meeting in June. He's going to be here in June for an ACLU meeting, and of course everyone in the book club knows him, so Clint (on), as it turns out, found out when Arthur's (Chaskalson) coming and we're organising a book club meeting. But do you know Geoff Budlender?

Int Yes, I've met him.

PC Well Geoff (Budlender) came to a book club meeting here, and of course we got talking about South Africa and one thing or another, and never talked about the book. And years later I was over in South Africa with SALSLEP and somebody mentioned the book club. They said, oh yes, we talked to Geoff Budlender, this is the book club where no-one reads the book (laughter)! And sometimes that's right. Or people read the book but then you get talking about President (Barack) Obama has just done something that day or one thing or another, but anyway Arthur (Chaskalson) will be at our book club meeting.

Int That's wonderful. The reason I bring up Arthur (Chaskalson) is that in many ways, the way you describe how you approached the project on South Africa within the Lawyers' Committee, is a measured response and it's exactly the way that Arthur (Chaskalson) started and ran the LRC. And I'm wondering in terms of knowing Arthur (Chaskalson) whether you could speak a little bit about that kind of measured response in South Africa and what that meant in terms of legal victories and legal approach in the test case approach?

PC Well, it's probably the reason the LRC survived. Lawyers generally, and South African lawyers in particular in those days, are more cautious and thoughtful than I am. I don't exist in a police state as South Africa was, and you could be banned like that, as you know, and they could take away your law licence and they don't have to

give you any reasons, nothing you can do. So you have to be very careful and it's a measure of one's prudence as to just how you can strike that balance and be helpful and be pushing the envelope to the extent that you can, without at the same time triggering the kind of adverse response that could sink your whole institution. And so, you know, obviously, not just I but Lloyd Cutler and the other leaders in SALSLEP, knew Arthur (Chaskalson) and knew Felicia (Kentridge), and we knew Sydney (Kentridge), and we saw that...to the extent this can be done in South Africa, these are the people who can do it well. And so we were pleased and proud to associate ourselves professionally with them.

Int You've known the Kentridges way before the LRC even began...

PC Yes.

Int ...and Felicia Kentridge...she was the pivotal kind of figure in not just in starting of the LRC but really also in terms of fund-raising, because right at the beginning, LRC was fortunate enough to get huge sums of... in South African terms, huge sums of funding from Ford, Carnegie, Rockefeller. I'm wondering if you could talk a bit about Felicia (Kentridge) and some of the special qualities that actually made this kind of project possible?

PC Yes, I was not with her in terms of talking to Ford Foundation and others...but my experience with those large foundations, New York foundations, is that a couple of things really influence their decisions to fund something new. One is the quality and reputation of the institution or the board of the institution. And the second is their assessment of the people who are going to be actually running this. Certainly that would be my judgment if I were in their place. When you get a group like the Lawyers' Committee, and I just use that, there are many other groups like that, but, you know, successful, intelligent, thoughtful people. They're not going to do something that will embarrass you. And they're quite likely to do something successful because they have successful careers and they've been successful in other areas. But beyond the board you also want to know, who is it? Who's going to be actually running this project? So Felicia (Kentridge) would be obviously impressive on both counts. She's a lawyer, deeply knowledgeable, highly sophisticated, super articulate...and with a history of involvement, both herself and with Sydney (Kentridge). So if you are heading up one of the foundations, and particularly later when SALSLEP got into it, and your advice or your assessment is being seconded by people like the Cutlers and the Griswolds it's not a hard sell when you have people like that. And she's a very bright and much more knowledgeable than anyone in the foundation at what can be done and what can't be done. She had answers. She would be able to say, well this, we think we can do this and we think we can do that. So she would be a very powerful and persuasive figure with foundations like that.

Int Early on in LRC's existence, they took on some major apartheid laws, such as the pass law, forced removals, and those were the key cases and key victories, like the Rikhoto case and the Komani case, I'm wondering you having been privy to the pass laws and experiences of ordinary black South Africans in terms of this oppressive

legislation, what that meant to you in the 1980s about seeing the LRC actually overturn some of these?

PC Yes, well, obviously it was a big, significant victory. I did go to the pass courts, Joel Carlson brought me there to radicalise me, I'm sure (laughter) and very successfully as it turned out. And I remember sitting there and "justice", if you want to call it that was dispensed in fifteen second intervals. The judge called someone over, and the person went down, and he said, "Is your boy here?" And we said, no, and he went back and reported that, and then he came back and said, well, can we help you with something? And we said, no. And then Joel said, no this is just a lawyer from America who's come to observe the proceedings. And then he said, thank you and went back and told the judge and then they postponed everything. They waited until I left and then they came back. But...I mean, the pass laws were in place to control the population, and of course were the basis for the day to day indignities visited upon black people in South Africa. So that victory was a big victory for the LRC. I must say that my memory of their cases is not sharp to say the least. You know, our role, as I saw it, on the board, was to raise money, put it over there, they would decide which cases to do and we knew they would do it as well as possible. And there was no real thought of trying to advise them, certainly not second guess them. Our role was to support them.

Int I'm wondering also, in terms of SALSLEP...there's been talk in interviews I've done with SALSLEP members about your role... you say it's to get the money to support them, etc, there seems to me there was a need, it arose from time to time, about wanting to do more...

PC Yes.

Int ...and I'm wondering whether you could speak a bit about that.

PC Sure. That need was driven by two, in my opinion...two factors. One, the scope of the needs in South Africa. And two, the assertiveness and creativity and degree of confidence of the people on the SALSLEP board. Man, we've got to do more, ok, we can raise some money for them and let's do everything we can, that takes fifteen minutes of talk. Now, we have these lively minds: what else can we do over there? And, yes, that was a constant tension. Now, we did some things well and some things not well. One thing we did pretty well, you may be aware of, is a scholarship program, where we raised money from law firms, and I know Aetna was one of the corporations, there may have been some others, but we raised money to send black South African college graduates through integrated law schools, and there was a whole selection process that went on over there, George Bizos, I think, chaired that. Essentially a law firm would "adopt" a student and carry that law student through. A number of those went on to become judges in South Africa, and one of the things I thought of doing when I was president of SALSLEP, but never did for a variety of reasons, was...and but it would be a very interesting thing for somebody to do, and that is just look at the files, pick out the names, find out what they're doing now. And maybe even pull together and conference of some of those people and some of the law

firms who sponsored them and do it around fund-raising...you know, here's Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, here are the two people you sponsored, they've now become judges, it would make Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering proud of its involvement and disposed to contribute to some related effort.

Int ...I think that's a brilliant idea and in a way I can answer that partly by being involved in this project, is that a lot of...especially the black lawyers, who have gone through the LRC training program, etc, are now judges on the Bench. Arthur (Chaskalson) and I have discussed this. (laughs)

PC Well, thanks, that's really something. Jim Robertson ran that project for a few years and then I ran it for a few years. We put a lot of people, a couple of dozen people, through law school. So that one worked. We also raised money to come up with a project in the late nineties, to expose black lawyers to the kinds of commercial practices that white law firms had. The idea, essentially, was to take a black lawyer and second him or her to a commercial white firm for six months or a year or something like that, pay their salary, with the understanding that that person would be given commercial law work and mentored and whatnot. And John Payton and I set that up when we were in South Africa for some other purpose and we hired a man to kind of oversee it, his name was Steyn. He was an associate of one of the universities and his father was a major ANC...he as white...his father was a major ANC figure in the earlier generation. And this fellow was very good and very knowledgeable and he'd done some work like that in the past. But frankly after a year or so, we found that it was not working well. Yes, we were able to place them, a lot of them weren't getting the commercial work, they were getting work with black clients and some pro bono type work, and they weren't learning what they had hoped to learn. It was no cost to the law firm because we were paying their salaries. And there was disillusionment there. I remember meeting with a woman over there who was assistant to the new Minister of Justice, and we were talking about how can we help black lawyers, and the suggestion I made was give preference to firms that have racially diverse partnership. Aetna did that and it helped. You've got to motivate the firms commercially. But here's what we learned about that project: the reason that I think it was unsuccessful, was we didn't have the kind of hands-on presence that you needed over there. What should have happened, we should have had meetings, maybe every three weeks, a luncheon meeting with all the black lawyers and get them to share their experience, and so, you know, once you saw that this pattern wasn't working then you go right to the law firm there, but we didn't have that kind of presence there. We were trusting that somehow it would work on its own and it did not. So the lesson we learned from that is there are things that we may be able to do well but there are a lot of things we can't do well, because we're not over there. And I didn't think SALSLEP should be over there trying to run all these other things. Let's find out who's doing what and maybe help support that. And what we did, we had some money left over from that project...and what we did was we gave it to a group called the Senior Lawyers Project, and these are largely retired or retiring American lawyers, we worked with them, and they sent lawyers to South Africa to give courses to black lawyers on commercial law, on a free basis, and that worked much better.

Int We're reached the hour mark and if you'd like to take a break or should we press on?

PC Press on. If you can take it, I can take it.

Int Sure. I'm wondering at what point in serving on the board of SALSLEP that you became the President and what were the circumstances that actually led to that?

PC Yes...I can't tell you the exact year...but that's ascertainable, I think I was President for about three years. I had been Treasurer. And we went to a new staffing mode where we engaged a woman named Camille Holmes, who had been a lawyer in Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, a very able young woman, to be a full-time Executive Director. Her salary was seventy-five thousand dollars a year and then there were benefits on top of that, and of course there was travel and other things. That ran up our annual expenditures for staff work. We did this for several years and of course I was the Treasurer so I was watching the money on this end, and I thought that regardless of the quality that she brought to that job, we couldn't afford it, and this is not what we should be doing. We should be spending just enough money on staff to help us raise money for the LRC because to the extent that we're spending this money for staff, that's less to give to the LRC. And of course the LRC noticed this as well. So...I felt that it was a mistake to continue going along in that direction and there was also some concern on the board about that. There was a meeting of the board and the upshot of it all was that I was asked if I would serve as President and Camille Holmes decided that she would leave and pursue some other legal job. So I took the job and decided that I would not hire staff. I am retired so there were some things that I could do. I could spend more time on it than others who were in law firms trying to serve as president. So I focused on that and my objective was to really try to get our financial house in order. And after a while doing it that way I then found a fellow by the name of Andrew Sillen...I don't know if you know Andrew Sillen but he had worked in South Africa, he's a fund-raiser and we engaged him on a very much part-time basis to try to help broaden the base of support for the LRC. And then that's the way we ran it, Andrew (Sillen) was our only staff person. And of course then when the Board met one of the things I said at the time was, look, we don't have any staff, here's the reason we don't any staff, I'm sure a lot of you have great ideas as to other things that SALSLEP can do. Please do not offer those ideas unless you are prepared to head it up! (laughter) So it kind of put the damper on brand new projects...suggesting brand new projects. But I think that SALSLEP had come to the point and Camille (Holmes) had tried to get us involved in various other things, and for a variety of reasons it didn't work or we couldn't raise the money for it, so we settled into, I think, a better understanding that our main goal was to raise as much money as we could for the LRC on an ongoing basis. And of course we also managed the two other accounts for Namibia and Zimbabwe. But we really didn't pay the kind of attention to those that we did to the LRC. And then after we stabilised the financial situation of SALSLEP, I reached out to Ann Satchwill who had worked for us before on a part-time basis, to bring her back on a part-time basis, partly to help me, but also I realised I had served my term and it's difficult to turn over presidency of a group like SALS if there's no staff at all, because then all the work really falls on the president. So I wanted Ann (Satchwill) there to be able to do that staff work but to do it on a part-time basis at a very limited cost so that we could focus on transferring as much money as possible to the LRC.

Int And you really were responsible for bringing Harvey (Dale) on board. I'm wondering whether you could say a bit about that?

PC I was. Yes, I...of course had heard about Harvey (Dale) through his participation on the LRC board, and I think he was the only American on the LRC board, and he was very helpful in raising money for the LRC, so we had this in common. I guess we had a couple of conversations and then we were reorganising the board to get some new people, new ideas and also some younger people on the board. Judy Thomson was the chair of that sub-committee that I participated on ex officio but she was the driving force and deserves enormous credit for what she did in that area. And so we thought who better to have on our board than somebody who already has that connection, has more knowledge about the LRC than any other American, including ourselves, so let's try to bring him on board. Then we had that great link at our meetings. So then he joined us and that big light went on, and I thought, wow, here's the next President (laughter). So we were able to convince him to take that on and it was great for...it was certainly great for SALS and I think is very good for the LRC as well.

Int Sure, and yes, you've left SALS in very good hands.

PC Yes...he's really a very, very able man and probably one of the accomplishments he'll be remembered for is changing the name (laughter). I'm trying to remember the name of that...I think it's a jelly or something...Smuckers...and they have an ad: "With a name like Smuckers you've got to be good." I used to think that way about SALSLEP (laughter). With a name like SALSLEP you've got to be good. SALS is much better.

Int So you would have stepped down as President towards the late 1990s, would that be correct, when Harvey (Dale) took over?

PC Harvey (Dale)...I think Harvey (Dale)...let's say Harvey (Dale) took over in say, '05...I would think it was...

Int Ok, so you were still around there.

PC So I took over probably in 2001, something. Something like that. *(break)*

Int So my question concerns that fact you went back to South Africa in 1994, if I'm correct and that was your second trip?

PC Yes.

Int Ok. I'm just wondering, prior to the 1994 trip, which I'm coming to now...the 1980s was really quite a turbulent time in South Africa's history in both positive and

negative ways, it was the height of repression but it was also the height of resistance movements, etc. Being in the United States, on the board of SALSLEP, I'm wondering what concerns you had, if any, about the safety of LRC members and also about what could be achieved in these turbulent times?

PC Yes...I would not say that I had deep concern. I recognised that there was danger there but I was very confident in the judgment of the people in the LRC and I just understood they knew the situation so much better than I, they're not going to deliberately or foolishly push beyond the zone that they recognised as a, probably a safe zone, within which to operate. And, you know, I was a little surprised they were able to accomplish as much as they did. I was very surprised that apartheid came to an end as soon as it did come to an end, because (FW) De Klerk did the hardest thing a politician can do, and that is, he gave up power before he had to. He could have strung it out maybe another ten years, I mean, it would have done tremendous damage to the country. But I remember reading his inaugural address...I don't know if that was what it was called, it was his first address to the Parliament...I got a copy of it from the South African embassy and I read it and I was astonished. It was the speech of an intelligent man speaking honestly to a group whose intelligence he respected. So different from the State of the Union messages here in the United States, the round of applause lines and one thing...there was an analysis of a problem and he had it about right, you know. And of course the lengths to which they were going with Nelson Mandela bringing him out of the prison, exposing him to the changes in the society. They were very careful and very cautious about how they went about turning over that power. I didn't think it would come then. And I thought that the diehard efforts on the part of some of the more conservative Afrikaners would be stronger, more persistent than they were. But, you know, I understand that what the men and women of the LRC was doing was in the forefront of law reform and therefore in that context dangerous. I understood that that's why we supported them as much as we could. I also understood by then that there were some things that could be done, that you could get acquittals from time to time, that you could win some lawsuits against the government, that it wasn't hopeless, it wasn't like trying to run that operation in what was then Communist China. So there were some possibilities and we simply and appropriately deferred to their judgment.

Int Ok, fair enough. I'm wondering, you mentioned that you were surprised by apartheid ending when it did end, what was your response given your longstanding involvement and history in South Africa?

PC I was delighted, I mean, it was a great, great victory. I understood everything wouldn't work smoothly but that there would be this transition after the election. It worked. A model, it seems to me, that many other countries should try to emulate. The elections themselves were edifying to watch, the tremendous turnout, and you know, they were three days, and the first day was reserved for the aged and the infirm, and I went to a hospital, and long line of people, all black African people, in their Sunday best. They were chatting away and it was a very joyful time. And then as they got close to the place where they actually voted, they became very quiet and very pensive. It was almost like being in church watching people waiting on line to go to confession, as their turn approached they got real quiet (laughter). And so I was inside

the voting room and they brought in an elderly black lady on a stretcher from the hospital, and there was another observer in there, and he said, well, this is a good day, and she said, yes, she said, it's really a wonderful day. She said, "I didn't think that I would live long enough to see this day." And then she reached out and took his hand and she said, now I know I'm somebody.

Int Gosh.

PC Yes, it was a tremendous thing to watch. And another day I went out...we were in Bophuthatswana, which was a very conservative area, and so we went out to a farm one time and people were waiting hours, and they brought this elderly, bent black woman, obviously osteoporosis, and she was blind and it looked like she had cataracts that had blinded her, she'd been standing out in the sun for hours waiting to vote. But of course she couldn't write because she's blind. So they brought her over to me and to this other man and he said, hello mama, and she said, hello. And he said, "Ok, we're here to register your vote, do you know whom you want to vote for?" And in a hoarse voice of a tired old woman, she said, (Nelson) "Mandela!" And she had waited hours to say that one word. So...I mean, it was a great inspiring three days to be able to watch that, observe that transition to power. And then to have that followed by the unique in history, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, was extraordinary. What an example...I mean, if people of Northern Ireland could learn from that and Kosovo and others. Maybe Bishop (Desmond) Tutu is the only person in the world that could have carried the whole thing off, but what an example of forgiveness and transition into a new and hopeful society. So I left there really inspired and optimistic and obviously, you know, there were car-jackings and drugs and weapons and things that came into it, and still enormous poverty there, but...well, things take time.

Int Sure. Arthur's (Chaskalson) been really the architect of the Constitution, and I'm wondering whether you were privy to any discussions around that or what your sense is of the Constitution?

PC No, I was not privy to any consultations with Arthur (Chaskalson). Gay McDougall...There was a conference over there, to draft of the Constitution, and Gay McDougall recruited a number of law firms in America to write a memoranda of law about certain provisions in the US Constitution, that they were interested in considering for incorporation in the South African Constitution, so they would have a deeper understanding of what those provisions involved. I was only tangentially involved in that, so I really don't have much of an answer to that question.

Int Sure. The Constitution has been described as an advanced Constitution, and I'm wondering in terms of rule of law under a transitional...society in South Africa, what were the concerns for the LRC in terms of here was this organisation that had really fought the apartheid regime and in many ways were aligned with the ANC...

PC Yes.

Int ...and now having an ANC led government, were there concerns about how the LRC would then function?

PC Obviously, yes. They would have to acclimate themselves to this changed environment and this changed context. But, I mean, it's one thing to have a democracy that's committed to the rule of law. If you don't have lawyers representing you in such a context, your interests won't be protected. And, you know, we have a pretty good Constitution right here in the United States and we have a whole statutory arrangement that's designed to promote racial justice in America. We have litigation on that all the time because we need to enforce the Constitution, we need to enforce the statutes of the new Constitution of course, where you don't have a history of the scope and meaning of the provisions, then there'll be even more litigation for the shaping of that Constitution. So it's clear that just as we needed a Lawyers' Committee and an ACLU and other groups here in the United States, there would be a need for an LRC to help shape that Constitution, and also to keep the government on the straight and narrow. You know, the Lawyers' Committee didn't stop suing the government just because we'd have a change of administration. It's part of the function, not only of the press, but of legal groups like that to criticize the government where appropriate and make the government enforce the laws.

Int One of the things that happened in the early 1990s to the mid 1990s was key people such as Arthur (Chaskalson), Geoff Budlender, George (Bizos) to some extent... ..then left for government. Were there concerns about the LRC in that respect and also did you sense a change in terms of the high turnover?

PC You know, the LRC was a victim of its own success in a way (laughs) and you want that. They had the...the best, but it was important that those people move to positions where they had even greater influence and opportunity, and then, you know, others will come and others will make their contribution. We never...we never after that, say in the nineties, were in a position to assess the quality of individual lawyers working for the LRC. But once again you just have to go on the basis of your trust in the group. The only criticism that I would offer, and this did not affect us as much as it affected the group in England, was that the LRC staff was not as diligent as they should have been in getting high quality timely reports to the group in England, so that they could in turn meet their commitment to foundations. You know, when you tell a foundation we'll report to you beginning of February and February comes, March comes, April comes, and you don't have your report, that adversely affects the reputation of the members of the board, the reputations of the group, and it hurts your ability to keep giving. We talked to Bongani Majola about this, and the answer basically was, well, the lawyers are so busy doing all this wonderful work that they're doing and don't have time, I didn't think that was a very good answer, because that work would come to a grinding halt were it not for foundation support and I think that the British group contributed something like eighty percent of their budget at the time. That's not so much a criticism of the individual lawyers as how it was managed, (and I know the...we want things differently in the United States than they do there, and it's almost like a union, I've been explained...sort of explained to me lately, of the lawyers who are out there in their individual fiefdoms and, you know, they don't always respond when the central office asks them to do something.) But that would be

the only criticism and I don't have any criticism of the substance of the legal work that they did.

Int Sure. Coming to that point, Reuben (Clark Sr) told me this wonderful story about accountability, and really actually to that end, Arthur (Chaskalson) doing even the book-keeping, the books, as such, at his kitchen table, and I'm wondering whether you think the kind of high turnover, especially at leadership level, impacted the effective functioning of the LRC during the late 1990s?

PC I don't really have an opinion on that, Roxsana. I know there was that turnover, I know...too much turnover is not a good thing for an organisation. You need some turnover though. And there's going to be a little turmoil in connection with a lot of turnover, but the question is how well you can contain that. Certainly as a board member of SALS, or when I was the President, that did not affect me. It didn't affect our relations with foundations or our ability to raise money, or our ability to get reports in that we could use to solicit funds from others. I know that it was a problem but it didn't impact us.

Int I'm wondering, it seems to me that somewhere around the mid 1990s the nature of funding changed and I'm wondering whether you could speak a bit more about that?

PC Yes, I can only speak generally. I think after the end of apartheid it became harder to raise money for South Africa, and I tried to explain this to...certainly to Bongani (Majola) and there was another fellow there, a fund-raiser named Tom...

Int Winslow.

PC Yes. That, you know, apartheid's over and Americans have a short memory and we want to move on to the next problem. And while I didn't think it was urgent, I was concerned and expressed this concern whenever I had the opportunity, that the LRC was only raising four percent of its budget from domestic South African resources and in my opinion that was not sustainable. Now you can scale down your operation or change it, do one thing or another, and I was told, oh, it's because they don't have the culture of giving. Well, they give to the churches and whatnot. But my concern was that if, as we contended, it is true that the major contributions of the LRC is to help make this democracy work, the people who have the biggest stake in making the democracy work are people who have been successful, who have vested interests, they should be turned to, and it seems to me a much more systematic effort should have been made to really try to raise as much money as possible in South Africa, because it's only going to get harder to raise it overseas, certainly in the United States, I don't know about the UK. But I know they had problems in the UK that were largely associated with their inability to get timely reports.

Int So in terms of handing over to Harvey (Dale)...did you remain on the board or did you leave SALS?

PC I remained on the board, then I transitioned to what we call an advisory committee, and I attended the first couple of meetings that Harvey (Dale) chaired, simply to show my continued support for him, but then I took the lead from the outgoing chairman of Aetna who said, when you're no longer running it, it's probably a good time to get off the board because your successor may want to make a whole lot of changes and you shouldn't be there opposing the changes (laughs). So, you know, Harvey (Dale) and the others know my heart is with them and I'll do anything I can for them, but it is important at some point to step off and make that cut clear so that everybody understands Harvey (Dale) is the one who's totally running it.

Int I'm also wondering, your long standing involvement, first with the Lawyers' Committee Project on South Africa and then through SALSLEP and SALS, if you had to reflect on that involvement where do you position it in your life history?

PC Where would I position it in my life's history? As one of the most fortunate gifts that I've been given. It was an opportunity to use the education I had and the interests I had to help in a very, very small way to advance the progress of humanity in South Africa. The end of apartheid was never inevitable. It was not inevitable. It became...tenuous but its end was not inevitable and it was certainly not inevitable that it would end when it ended, thus improving the lives of so many people between 1994 and when it might have ended. And if you look back...it's almost like having been given an opportunity to play a role in the end of slavery in the United States. These opportunities don't come along very often and it's why we're here...it's why we're here. We're here to help other people. That's why human beings are created. When you think what makes you happy, it's in connection with loving relationships with other people. That's how we're programmed, you know. And being angry with somebody else, how that makes you feel as a human being. We're supposed to be helping other people, we're supposed to be extending some kindness to other people, and acting on feelings of empathy for other people. And, you know, this opportunity came along to help in that regard and it was a very, very small contribution in the nature of things, but I was involved in it either full-time or part-time for twenty-five years and I was really pleased to have done it.

Int I'm also wondering, part of being on the SALSLEP board was the formation of very close friendships and I wondered where you...you obviously had a very close friendship with Jim Robertson whom I've interviewed...I wonder whether you could talk a bit about the firm friendships you built, not just on the board of SALSLEP but also with the Kentridges, Arthur Chaskalson, Geoff Budlender and others? Your stories and memories are welcome.

PC Yes. Well, you know...I did know Geoff (Budlender), I didn't know him well. We'd met a few times, we'd shared involvement in LRC and whatnot. And so twelve years ago, I had prostate cancer, and I had a letter from Geoff (Budlender) from out of the blue and I mean, it was just...I'm not the kind of guy who needs a lot of support and I probably don't present myself as the kind of person that needs a lot of support, but I welcome it. And this came from out of the blue and I was really very appreciative of that. I've really enjoyed working with the Kentridges over the years. We just went down to the Kennedy Center to see their son's film. And it gives you a feeling of

being a part of something that transcends your own country, you know, you see people across the world, on the other side of the world, who are struggling for the same ends that you're struggling for, and it...it gives you encouragement and inspiration to continue on and just a wonderful feeling about being able to associate with people of that quality and level of commitment. It really is...I mean, it was just a terrific gift. I knew Jim Robertson and Clint(on) Bamberger very well before that, but again, you're with these people and you can see they really care about that, and so it's something that reinforces the bonds that are already there. And then of course I met new people and formed new friendships with people like Margie Marshall, for example, Jamie Kilbreth, Reuben (Clark, Sr.), that's how I got to know Reuben (Clark, Sr.), Judy Thomson, Henry Rhoads. I used to really look forward to the meetings and to the dinners, just to see these people. They were such decent, highly motivated people who would...particularly when I was President for a while...do anything they could to help support the effort.

Int What contribution do you think the SALSLEP made to the LRC, if you had to critically examine it?

PC A modest financial contribution over the years. We were a conduit for money from other foundations, and we did raise some money from lawyers generally. So we helped in that regard, but more so in the days of apartheid, I think the LRC would have been missing something if it didn't have a link to a legal element like SALSLEP in the United States. Because that link said to everybody what they're doing is important and it's respected by knowledgeable people who are engaged in similar undertakings in the United States. And they were...I exclude myself from this...but they were if you look at the Cutlers and Griswolds and others, these were very high level people in American society, and I think their support, though intangible, was helpful to the LRC. But you'll have to ask the LRC people (laughs) whether they thought it was as much help as we thought it was.

Int I think, definitely, Arthur (Chaskalson) and others would really concur that it was an enormous help. It is an enormous help; it continues to be.

PC Well, I'm glad that it was.

Int In terms of public interest law...and I'm asking really in terms of your involvement in the Lawyers' Committee...public interest law in America and public interest law in South Africa, what are the parallels if any, and then the points of divergence?

PC Well, the parallels are that in the United States we have institutions like the ACLU, the NAACP, ARC Fund, the Lawyers' Committee, the Anti-Defamation League, other groups like this that use the law to protect and advance certain interests similarly to what the LRC does in South Africa. I don't know how many other groups like the LRC there are in South Africa now. But that is a similarity that lawyers who understand that in a society governed by the rule of law there is a role for lawyers, as well as politicians. The divergences I'm not real sure of, but at least back when I was more closely associated with it, in the US there is a pro bono public of tradition. And

it is particularly alive in the big firms. It was...you'll read about it in Ann's book...The Lawyers' Committee was in at the ground floor of that, stimulating it. It came in the United States in the late sixties, in the height of the Civil Rights Movement and the anti-war movement, when really good law students coming out of the best law schools, wanted either to become involved in full-time work like that, or at least have a commitment from the firms that they would be able to do pro bono work in these significant areas, not just representing a tenant case but significant areas. So, the big firms in competing for these people created these opportunities and The Lawyers' Committee helped foster that. I don't think there was a tradition in South Africa of the law firms engaging in pro bono work, and I don't know whether it has developed in the last decade or two. I'd be surprised if it has or to the extent that it may have, if it were be handling the kinds of real challenges like the LRC did with the HIV, for example, a tremendously significant victory. You know, that may be a cultural difference that won't be changed in short term. I'm reluctant to try to recommend the adoption by other cultures, of American traditions, particularly one as new as this one is here. We're still working on this one. But I think that may be a difference and an important difference.

Int South Africa's thirteen years into democracy and is really still in the throes of transition. In terms of rule of law issues what is your sense of the major challenges South Africa faces?

PC Wow, I hadn't thought of that, that's a very good question. There are, I think, two fundamental problems that face South Africa: the endemic poverty and not unrelated to that, the high incidence of violent crime. We have not solved those problems in this country. And they are very much rule of law type problems because there are various ways to respond to these problems. The way we have responded in the United States is to warehouse people. We have over a million people in prisons in the United States, half of whom are black. Particularly with respect to drug related crimes, they send them away for a long time. An alternative would be to spend a third of that money on effective drug treatment rehabilitation programs and employment vocational education for people, so that they can get jobs so that their lives aren't hopeless. That's one way that our law and legal system has addressed similar problems and I think addressed them wrongly. I haven't been that close to it but South Africa has to be really careful about what they do about the incidents of violent crime because there's a danger of having just a whole lot of little gated constellations around, or having people just throw up their hands and say, this is no quality of life I'm going to leave, and the effect that that would have on the society and on the economy. As far as the economic problems are concerned they've made some considerable progress since 1994 but the pie is only so big. They've got to grow the pie and the way to grow the pie is to improve the economy, and one way to improve the economy is to draw more foreign capital from overseas. One of the things that hurts that...we heard from the Undersecretary of Commerce at a SALSLEP dinner a few years ago, one of the things that hurts that was the HIV epidemic. Companies would say you have to hire two people for each new job because of the HIV, whereas if I go to Malaysia I don't have to worry about that. So, you know, those problems are all related problems and I think South Africa was slow to move on HIV/AIDS. For some reason, (Thabo) Mbeki didn't want to face the reality there. But in terms of the rule of law itself, how you handle that...how the South Africans handle that criminal problem, is really

important, and I would hope that they would handle it more like European countries do, than the United States. Essentially the rule of law depends upon the support for the law and the confidence in law on the part of the people. They have to have some faith in their government and they have to see progress being made, not just in ending discrimination but in creating economic opportunities for the people. Of course it's very difficult with Zimbabwe on the border and all the refugees coming down from Zimbabwe. So, you've got to keep getting really good people on the courts, and handling the criminal problem, handling the drug problem, and obviously Americans don't have good answers for that yet.

Int Peter, I've asked you a range of questions, and in the process, consumed a significant amount of your time on a lovely afternoon. I'm wondering whether there are things that I've neglected to ask you, perhaps even from a legal perspective which you think really ought to form part of the LRC Oral History interview?

PC As far as the selection of the areas in which the LRC engages and the cases, which it takes, I defer one hundred percent to their judgement as I should. I have what I consider an appropriately limited idea of what SALS ought to be doing. We'll be looking for every opportunity we can to help and to support the LRC in terms that they define as helping and supporting and that's what we should do. Particularly we should try to help them raise money and maybe participate in conferences where we can share ideas and experiences in this area with them. But one of the challenges of SALS, and one of the challenges Harvey has, of course, is to take a group of leaders and convince them that their job is not to lead but to follow and to support in this particular area. You lead in a lot of areas, other areas of your life, but the LRC doesn't need our leadership. It probably doesn't need our ideas, although...they welcome them, discuss them, consider them, but I mean, if I were running the LRC, what I would look to SALS for, is as much support as possible and in exchange for that support I would listen courteously to the ideas that they have to offer (laughs). Some of them may prove to be good and then you can put something in the oven and go from there. But I think that's one of the challenges of SALSLEP, and maybe I have too limited a view but as I say we have done some other things pretty well, like the scholarship program, but...the LRC is doing very, very well, they don't need any suggestions of direction from us. The only exception I would offer there is that...and I'm sure Harvey is telling them this all the time...they do need to appreciate the fact that they need to be around for the long term but that funding from the United States may not continue, or at least at the levels we've enjoyed in the past, for a long time, and therefore it's really important, as difficult as it may be, that they strive in a systematic and ongoing way to try as much as possible to make the LRC self-supporting in South Africa. Because the need for the LRC in the future will always be there.

Int Peter, would you like to end with any particular memory or story that you'd like to share of the LRC?

PC I thought I'd told every story (laughs) I have that relates to the LRC and to SALS. No, I probably can't think of anything else to cap it off with. But I've enjoyed this very much and thank you for coming down and spending all this time with me.

Int Well, thank you very much on behalf of SALS and also LRC, in terms of sharing your thoughts and your memories. We really appreciate it.

PC Well, thank you.

Peter Connell–Name Index

Arnold, Millard, 15
Bamberger, Clinton, 14, 15, 16, 17, 28
Biko, Stephen Bantu (Steve), 7
Bizos, George, 4, 12, 19, 25
Boggs, Rod, 14, 15
Bork, Judge, 8
Budlender, Geoff, 17, 25, 27
Carlson, Joel, 3, 4, 19
Carter, Jimmy, 14, 16
Chaskalson, Arthur, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
Clark, Reuben (Sr.), 26, 28
Coleman, Bill, 16
Connell, Ann, 4, 9
Connell, Michaela, 8
Cutler, Lloyd, 4, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 28
Dale, Harvey, 21, 22, 26, 27
De Klerk, FW., 23
Doar, John, 10
Douglas, John, 10, 11, 14
Filer, John, 6
Ford, Gerald, 16
Griswold, Erwin, 7, 16, 18, 28
Holmes, Camille, 21
Hurd, John Gavin, 12
Johnson, Lyndon, 10
Katzenbach, Nick, 10
Kennedy, John, F., 9, 10
Kennedy, Robert (Bob), 10, 16
Kentrige, Felicia, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27
Kentrige, Sydney, 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 27
Kilbreth, Jamie, 28
King, Martin Luther, 10
Lindsay, John, 11, 12
Lindsay, George, 11, 14
Loss, Louis, 7
Majola, Bongani, 25, 26
Mandela, Nelson, 23
Mandela, Winnie, 1, 3
Marshall, Burke, 10
Marshall, Margaret (Margie), 28
Marshall, Thurgood, 4
Mbeki, Thabo, 29
McDougall, Gay, 5, 13, 15, 24
Nolan, John, 10
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, 4
Nupen, Charles,
Obama, Barack, 17
Oberdorfer, Lou (Judge), 9, 10

Payton, John, 20
Peay, Mike 15
Pollack, Louis (Dean), 7
Pollack, Steve, 10
Robertson, Jim, 4, 8, 20, 27, 28
Robinson, Jackie, 8
Rhoads, Henry, 28
Runyon, Charlie, 1, 11
Satchwill, Ann, 21
Sillen, Andrew, 21
Sorensen, Ted, 14
Steyn, 20
Tatel, David, 15
Thomson, Judy, 22, 28
Tutu, Desmond Mpilo, 24
Winslow, Tom, 26

Cases:

Biko Inquest, 13
Komani, 18
Rikhoto, 18

Legal Resources Centre Oral History Project

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, William Cullen Library, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. These digital records are digital copies of electronic documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

DOCUMENT DETAILS:

Document ID:- AG3298-1-030

Document Title:- Peter Connell Interview

Author:- Legal Resources Centre South Africa (LRC)

Document Date:- 2008